 · '.	
1	EVELLE J. YOUNGER, Attorney General
2	SAMUEL E. SPITAL, Deputy Attorney General
3	110 West "A" Street, Suite 600 San Diego, California 92101
4	Telephone: (714) 237-7873
5	Attorneys for Complainant
6	
7	·
8	BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
9	BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
11	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
12	
13	In the Matter of the Accusation) NO. D-1881 Against:
14	ANTHONY J. RIPPO, M.D.
15	3340 Kemper Street) DECISION San Diego, California)
16 17) Physician's and Surgeon's)
18	Certificate No. G-13741,
19	Respondent.
20	The attached Stipulation for Settlement is hereby
21	adopted by the Division of Medical Quality, Board of Medical
22	Quality Assurance of the State of California as its Decision
23	in the above entitled matter.
24	
25	This Decision shall become effective on the 20th day of FEBRUARY , 1978.
26	
	IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 20th day of JANUARY, 1978.
27	C Ball

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72) BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE Department of Consumer Affairs State of California

	11 .		
1	EVELLE J. YOUNGER, Attorney General SAMUEL E. SPITAL,		
2	Deputy Attorney General		
3	110 West "A" Street, Suite 600 San Diego, California 92101		
4	Telephone: (714) 237-7873		
5	Attorneys for Complainant		
6			
7			
8	BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY		
9	BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE		
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
11	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
12			
13	In the Matter of the Accusation) NO. D-1881		
14	Against:		
15	ANTHONY J. RIPPO, M.D.) 3340 Kemper Street) STIPULATION FOR		
16	San Diego, California) SETTLEMENT		
17	Physician's and Surgeon's) Certificate No. G-13741)		
18	Respondent.		
19			
20	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the		
21	parties to the above entitled matter that the following allega-		
22	tions are true:		
23	1. That Raymond M. Reid, complainant at the time of		
24	the filing of the within accusation, and the Executive Officer		
25	of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance, and Robert Rowland,		
26	currently Executive Director of the Division of Medical Quality,		
27	Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the Department of Consumer		
,	i		

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

Affairs of the State of California, are represented herein by Evelle J. Younger, Attorney General of the State of California, by Samuel E. Spital, Deputy Attorney General.

- 2. That Anthony J. Rippo, M.D., is represented by Platt, Tebbetts & Peterson, by Harold F. Tebbetts, Esq. That respondent has retained Harold F. Tebbetts, Esq. as his attorney in regard to the administrative action herein and that the respondent has counseled with Harold F. Tebbetts concerning the effect of this Stipulation, which the respondent herein has carefully read and scrutinized and which he fully understands.
- 3. That the respondent has received and read the Accusation which is presently on file and pending in Case No. D-1881 before the Division of Medical Quality, Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the Department of Consumer Affairs of the State of California.
- 4. That the respondent understands the nature of the charges alleged in the above mentioned Accusation and that said charges and allegations would constitute causes for imposing discipline upon the respondent's physician's and surgeon's certificate heretofore issued by the Board of Medical Quality Assurance.
- 5. That the respondent and his counsel are aware of each of respondent's rights, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations; respondent's right to confront and cross-examine witnesses who would testify against him; respondent's right to present evidence in his favor or to call witnesses in his behalf, or to so testify himself; respondent's right to

contest the charges and allegations and any other rights which may be accorded him pursuant to the California Administrative Procedure Act (Gov. Code § 11500, et seq.); his right to reconsideration, appeal to superior court and to any other or further appeal; that respondent understands that in signing this Stipulation, rather than contesting the Accusation, he is enabling the Division of Medical Quality, Board of Medical Quality Assurance, to revoke his license, which was heretofore issued by the Board of Medical Quality Assurance, upon this Stipulation without further process.

- 6. That respondent freely and voluntarily waives each and every one of the rights set forth hereinabove; that respondent, rather than contesting the charges in the Accusation presently on file at a formal hearing, for the purpose of the instant proceeding before the Division of Medical Quality, Board of Medical Quality Assurance, only, admits and stipulates to the truth and accuracy of each and every one of the allegations and charges enumerated in paragraphs 1 through and including 3(v), on pages 1 through and including page 5 of the said Accusation.
- 7. That the Division of Medical Quality, Board of Medical Quality Assurance, has the authority to take disciplinary action against respondent's license pursuant to sections 2360 and 2392 of the Business and Professions Code.
- 8. That based upon all of the foregoing admissions, stipulations and recitals it is stipulated and agreed that the Division of Medical Quality, Board of Medical Quality Assurance,

may issue a Decision upon this Stipulation whereby:

A. Physicians and Surgeons Certificate No. G-13741 heretofore issued to respondent Anthony J. Rippo, is hereby revoked, provided, however, said revocation is stayed for a period of five (5) years on the following conditions:

Respondent shall not during the first 90 days immediately following the effective date of the decision of the Division of Medical Quality, Board of Medical Quality Assurance, exercise any of the rights and privileges granted to him by his license to practice medicine and surgery, provided, however, that respondent may before the effective date of said decision submit a proposed program to said Division of unpaid community medical service of at least 104 hours per 180 days for two years and after this Division's written approval of such program respondent may resume the full practice of medicine, provided further that respondent shall make and keep complete and accurate records of such community service if such be elected. Respondent shall elect either the 90 days actual suspension or community medical service, but not a combination of the two.

25

26

(2) Respondent shall comply with all laws of the United States, State of California and its political subdivisions and at resumption of practice, the rules and regulations of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance.

- (3) Respondent shall initiate and file with the Division of Medical Quality at its office in Sacramento, California, at quarterly intervals after the effective date of this order, an affidavit setting forth the respondent's then present residence and office addresses, and shall set forth, if such be the case, that respondent has fully and faithfully complied with all of the terms and conditions of probation herein imposed; if respondent has failed to comply with any of the terms and conditions of probation, or has committed any acts in violation of this order, the same shall be fully set forth and explained in said affidavit. Failure to file this affidavit or to include therein the information above specified shall constitute a violation of the terms of probation.
- (4) Respondent shall within 90 days of the effective date of the decision report in person to the Regional Medical Consultant of

1

the Division of Medical Quality, and thereafter at such times and places specified and at least two times each year during said period of probation. It shall be the responsibility of respondent to request of said Division the appropriate times and places.

Respondent shall fully and completely (5) comply with the Probation Surveillance Program and cooperate with any agent of the Board operating thereunder, including the making available for inspection respondent's records of community medical service if such service be elected hereunder.

Should the Division of Medical Quality, after notice to respondent and an opportunity to be heard, determine that respondent has during the period of probation violated any term or condition herein imposed, said Division may reimpose the revocation or make such other or further order as it may then deem just and reasonable in the exercise of its discretion. Proceedings to reimpose the revocation or make any other disciplinary order with respect

R. SHERMAN PLATT
NOTARY PUBLIC
PRINCIPAL OFFICE
SAN DEEDO CO. CUTE
M. Commission Exp. Dec. 20, 1978

25

26

27

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

EVELLE J. YOUNGER, Attorney General LYNN HENRY JOHNSON, 1 Assistant Attorney General 800 Tishman Building 3580 Wilshire Boulevard 3 Los Angeles, California 90010 Telephone: (213) 736-2012 4 Attorneys for Complainant 5 6 7 BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY 3 BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE Q DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 10 IN THE MATTER OF THE ACCUSATION 11 AGAINST NO. D-1881 12 ANTHONY J. RIPPO, M.D., License #G13741 13 ACCUSATION Medi-Cal ID #000G13710, 14 Respondent. 15 16 COMES NOW RAYMOND M. REID and for cause of disciplinary action against the above named respondent alleges as follows: 17 18 That Raymond M. Reid is the Executive Officer of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California, 19 hereinafter sometimes called "the Board"; and that Raymond M. 20 Reid makes the allegations of the within Accusation in his 21 22 official capacity and not otherwise; 2. That respondent Anthony J. Rippo, M.D., holds a 23 license to practice medicine in the State of California under the 24 authority of the Board; and that at all times mentioned herein 25 said license has been, and now is, in full force and effect and 26 never has been suspended or revoked; 27

pursuant to the provisions of Business and Professions Code

sections 2360 and 2392 for aiding and abetting an unlicensed

person in the practice of medicine, the circumstances of

28

29

30

37

3. That respondent is subject to disciplinary action

respondent's offenses being more particularly set forth hereinafter.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

- (I) That respondent operated two clinics in a rural area of San Diego County at all times relevant to the within Accusation; that one clinic may be referred to as the Jacumba Clinic; that the other clinic may be referred to as the Campo Clinic; that respondent was routinely present at the Campo Clinic; that respondent operated the Jacumba Clinic through a person who held no license whatsoever, one Gary Spath; that respondent game to the Jacumba Clinic only on Wednesdays; that patients coming to the Jacumba Clinic were seen and treated by the unlicensed person as a matter of routine; that many, if not most, of such patients were never seen by respondent; that if the unlicensed person felt that he needed any assistance, he would telephone respondent and relate to him any particular problem the unlicensed person might be experiencing.
- (II) That Gary Spath does not hold any license, certificate, authority, or permit, whatsoever, to practice medicine, or any other healing art, in the State of California, in any manner, method, mode or means whatsoever.
- (III) That on December 26, 1975, at the Jacumba Clinic, Spath treated for his ailments patient Raymond R in an office visit and prescribed medicine for the patient; that Spath again did exactly the same things for

the same patient on January 2, 1976; that on January 24, 1976, Spath treated for her ailments patient Patricia R at the Jacumba Clinic in an office visit and prescribed medicine for the patient; that on January 30, 1976, Spath treated for her ailments the same patient in a call upon her at her house and supplied medicine to the patient; that on January 12, 1976, Spath treated for her ailments patient Kathleen R at the Jacumba Clinic in an office visit and prescribed medicine for the patient; that Spath did the same thing for the same patient on January 13, 1976; that Spath prescribed medicine for the same patient on January 13, 1976; that Spath treated for her ailments the same patient on January 14, 1976, at the Jacumba Clinic in an office visit; that on December 12, 1975, Spath treated for his ailments patient Olin Terms at the Jacumba Clinic; and that on December 21, 1975, prescribed medicine for the same patient; that on December 26, 1975, Spath treated for his ailments the same patient at the Jacumba Clinic in an office visit; that on January 10, 1976, Spath treated for her ailments patient Sandra H her house and prescribed medicine for the patient; that on January 11, 1976, Spath treated for her ailments the same patient in a call at her house; that on January 8, 1976, Spath treated for her ailments patient

Carol Lemma in a call at her house, and prescribed medicine for the patient; that on January 11, 1976, Spath treated for her ailments the same patient in a call at her house; that on January 13, 1976, Spath treated for her ailments the same patient in a call at her house; that on October 26, 1975, Spath treated for his ailments patient Christopher L at the Jacumba Clinic; that on December 26, 1975, Spath treated for his ailments the same patient at the same clinic and prescribed medicine for the patient; that on December 31, 1975, Spath treated for his ailments the same patient at the Jacumba Clinic in an office visit; that on January 11, 1976, Spath treated for his ailments the same patient in a house call; that on January 13, 1976, Spath treated for her ailments patient Teri H a house call; that on January 13, 1976, Spath diagnosed for her ailments the same patient through urinalysis and prescribed medicine for the patient; that on January 16, 1976, Spath treated for her ailments the same patient in a call at her house.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

- (IV) That at all times mentioned herein Spath was an employee of respondent, acting under authority illegally granted to him by respondent, and respondent was well aware of Spath's activities.
- (V) That in connection with all of the treating and prescribing set forth in paragraphs

I and III hereinabove respondent submitted claims to Medi-Cal which indicated that respondent was the one who had done the treating, prescribing, and diagnosing done by Spath, as set forth in paragraphs I and III hereinabove; and that on no occasion listed hereinabove did respondent see any of the patients referred to hereinabove in any way whatsoever.

WHEREFORE, complainant prays that the Board take disciplinary action against respondent and that the Board take such other and such further action as is deemed meet in the premises.

DATED: This 47 day of October, 1976.

LHJ:ja 3573101-

476AD1282¹ 9-14-76 RAYMOND M. REID, Executive Officer Board of Medical Quality Assurance Department of Consumer Affairs State of California

Complainant